

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

Job No. 22192
Written Response Required? NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 4170; 8830/4170

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - NOVEMBER 9, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE NOVEMBER 12, 1998

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Info Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

Date: November 16, 1998

Location: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on November 9, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

COMMENT: I (Dirk Dunning) would like to state something up front. I just received an e-mail from Karen Strickland regarding tomorrow's Long Range Plan (LRP) meeting and the problems with the telephone tie-in. I understand that you have decided not to have the telephone link open for call-in participation. This is another example of the continuing public involvement problems surrounding the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project (GW/VZ Project). This is less than 24 hours notice, and it is very difficult to plan to attend in person on such short notice.

RESPONSE: The reason why we decided to not have the phone link open is that this meeting would be even more frustrating than normal for people calling in. There will be a lot of discussion surrounding charts and time lines. It's going to be a very visual meeting. Phone participation simply would not be very effective.

MIN11-09.WPD

RESPONSE: The meeting is designed as a work session with Mary Harmon and Bob Alvarez from the Department of Energy Headquarters (DOE-HQ) to go over the LRP. The Department of Ecology and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will also be represented. There are large charts that have been drawn up and are posted on the wall. This will be a working session with HQ and regulators. We want to get their input on what their expectations are for the LRP, and to determine what they see as the key issues surrounding the December deliverable. We also want to get their feelings on the integration process. We want to see where they think we are, and where they think we should be. It's not going to be a standard meeting.

COMMENT: It's just another problem with the Project's public involvement. You can't change the plans less than a day before the meeting and expect people to be able to be flexible enough to change too.

RESPONSE: The problem is that there are objects that need to be seen.

COMMENT: It just feels like we (Oregon) are the poor stepchild in this process. We've pushed hard for funding, but haven't gotten any funding ourselves for involvement in this Project. I (Dirk Dunning) will be there tomorrow, but I can not get there until 9 a.m. Can you push the start back from 8 a.m. in recognition of the late notice?

RESPONSE: Give us a chance to talk to Mary and Bob about it. They are not here yet. We'll come back to it later.

COMMENT: Oregon is a major player in this, and we're consistently treated like we're not one.

QUESTION: Is this a funding issue?

ANSWER: That's part of it. Another part is receiving adequate notice of things. Getting notice of something less than a day before it happens is unacceptable. Funding is definitely an issue too though.

RESPONSE: Let's bring that up with the Policy Work Group. We're really trying to open things up for involvement as much as possible, but the schedules for Mary, Bob, and the regulators were set last Friday.

COMMENT: You could have called Friday then.

RESPONSE: I (Michael Graham) was tied up at the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting. We'll continue to try to improve on how we involve you.

POLICY WORK GROUP UPDATE (DRU BUTLER): We've decided to move the Policy Work Group meetings to every other week instead of weekly in order to allow for more focus on the December deliverable. There were three new issues discussed this week that came out of the System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group meetings. They were the Project scope concerning source terms, the possibility of an independent oversight by the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) Board (specifically of the candidate study sets), and the fact that endstates are not defined for the current mission. Tom Page will issue papers to address these issues. The next Policy Work Group meeting will be on November 16 from 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) building, Room 1B40.

Rich Holten also handed out a new version of the "DOE Management and Decision Processes," as well as an authority matrix. Have you gotten any comments in yet Rich?

RESPONSE: No, not yet. I'm going to be busy this week with the HQ people here. I probably wouldn't be able to do anything with comments until later this week at any rate. I'd like to have those comments by November 12.

TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEMS (TWRS) VADOSE ZONE (VZ) NEGOTIATIONS: (Stan Leja)
DOE gave Ecology a change package for VZ Corrective Action milestones. Ecology will take a look at those and come back Thursday with more detailed milestones. We will add to what was given us and change them to some degree. We've held a couple of technical sessions this week and this morning. We're trying to flesh out how much information is necessary, and we're trying to determine if we need to think about reevaluating existing VZ data. We need to look at all aspects that are relevant to a VZ characterization with the idea being to make the characterization a little more effective and reduce the costs of doing characterization in the future. We also have discussed whether or not that information would be useful to help pick a location to start. It should at least be used as a factor. We've discussed other criteria as well, including risk, types of contamination, flow, time for contaminants to reach the Columbia River, etc. On most of the technical issues we're pretty close. There are some philosophical differences between Ecology and DOE regarding priorities. We're planning on discussing those in more detail this coming Thursday.

COMMENT: You mentioned risk as a determining factor of where to begin the characterization. I (Marty Bensky) liked the idea that the information that comes out of this be things that will support the modeling effort better. There is enough time to work risk. Find a "clean" site with known sources and contaminants so that the data you collect will support modeling.

RESPONSE: The problem with that is that contaminant transport is site specific, but it is one of the factors that will be taken into consideration. We're kicking around anything that might be helpful in the future.

QUESTION: Is the deadline you're shooting for still December 4?

RESPONSE: We're still on track for the December 4 deadline. Nothing that's come out of the negotiations to this point has suggested not being able to do that. DOE and Ecology have a number of meetings scheduled in the coming month. Right now we have at least one scheduled every week and we might modify that as the date gets a little closer. It will take a little longer to make the actual modifications to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), but the negotiations should be complete by December 4.

QUESTION: What are the drivers behind that particular date? The reason I ask is that early on we got into a discussion with Ecology that things were getting pushed through too fast and hard. As a result, the right people were not being involved. What happens if December 4 is not met, due to the need for added discussions?

ANSWER: Both sides are committed to completing this by December 4. A letter that DOE received from Ecology suggested the December 4 date. There is nothing specific that happens if December 5 rolls around and there isn't an agreement, but both Ecology and DOE have committed to December 4. Stan gave a pretty good summation of where we are. We're right on track. We

still need to discuss certain things and decide where to put the emphasis. Should it be on short-term corrective measures or focus more on data collection? We talked about the issue of the deadline at one of the sessions. We agreed that if things are getting close to closure, but it looks like we need more time to iron out a few details, we can just go and ask for an extension.

RESPONSE: It all depends on how far we've gotten. If not all the issues are decided by December 4, but we're along the right path, there should be grounds to extend the deadline.

RESPONSE: We've agreed on an overall framework, but we haven't nailed down all the details yet.

COMMENT: I have one thing to add (David Olson). One of the things we're struggling with in designing the Corrective Actions is that there are Environmental Restoration (ER) sites associated with the Tank Farms, like specific retention trenches. There is an integrated, near-term strategy for 200 Area closure. There is a near-term characterization plan. You have to include the ER sites with the Tank Farms in the model and decide how to characterize them. You can't ignore those sites, but you have to decide how to bring them into TWRS without completely reworking the 200 Area strategy. We're kicking ideas around for the near-term regarding that.

COMMENT: That needs to be reflected in the Project's LRP/Baseline.

QUESTION: Could you elaborate on the issue of bringing the tank related cribs in with the TWRS project? Is this an organizational issue, or one of regulatory framework, or what?

ANSWER: Basically, we need to think in terms of what makes sense. To do that, we need to characterize past Tank Farm discharges. It's not clear if that means specific retention, drainage, leaks, or what. In looking at some of the sites to characterize, we're going back and looking at the ER sites associated with the tanks. We have to go back and look at characterization from a joint ER-TWRS perspective. We need to pick those sites for characterization. One quick way is to include those sites that are possibly associated with the Tank Farms.

QUESTION: Does that include the IMUST (Interim Miscellaneous Underground Storage Tanks) tanks as well? Are you looking at all the cats and dogs that might be issues? What's the view of them as potential source terms?

ANSWER: We have not talked specifically about IMUST. There are about 60 or so IMUST tanks out there. TWRS owns about 43 of those more or less. We've looked at those tanks that pose the greatest risk from a safety standpoint. Most of them are empty or very nearly empty. The ones owned by TWRS are mostly catch tanks for inadvertent drainage. If anyone would like to set up a specific time to talk about how IMUST is related to TWRS, I (Jim Poppiti) would be happy to sit down with them.

COMMENT: There is a schedule for what happens on the Farms in place for this year based on TPA milestones. The desire of EPA is to continue with the Fiscal Year (FY) 99 work, and look at replanning for FY00 or beyond, depending on the outcomes of the Tank Farm negotiations.

COMMENT: The discussion tomorrow on the LRP should help to clear some of this stuff up. Once you see the bigger picture, you'll see how some of this comes together. You'll see the need to look at

both the assessment phase and the cleanup phase. You'll see the connections between cleanup and interim actions and long-term goals. You can see how tools like the SAC will help in the process. When we see all that on paper tomorrow, it will become clearer.

LONG RANGE PLAN WORKING SESSION (TOM WINTCZAK): There is a working session scheduled tomorrow to discuss the LRP/Project Baseline. The start has been moved from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. to accommodate Oregon. It will be in the BHI building, Room 1B40. The purpose for the session is to get perspectives and input from regulators and DOE-HQ, identify the issues and things we should flag, and discuss how the December deliverable should unfold.

We have had discussions with Ecology and EPA about their expectations, and that's one of the things that we plan to work on tomorrow. We want to identify and lock down what the different expectations are of what the LRP is to be used for. Everybody has a different view, and tomorrow should be an excellent opportunity to get all of those down on paper, whether they be from contractor, DOE-HQ, or regulatory perspectives. That is starting to take some shape. Is this document going to satisfy all of the expectations? Hopefully, it will capture most of them in the first shot.

The current focus is the working sessions this week. We will worry about whatever needs that are identified beyond that later. We're getting input from TWRS on Wednesday. We'll look at some of their planning assumptions and re-baseline things. We will have a little better package prepared for the Expert Panel. The next two weeks there is going to be a lot of work on this particular activity. It will give us the chance to walk through things with the Expert Panel and get their input and support.

We are trying to ensure that people are involved in a meaningful way throughout the process of creating the LRP/Project Baseline. The Baseline will be out for public review for a couple of months next calendar year. We just want people to recognize that there are opportunities for participation and input all along the way, but as with anything, the earlier the input, the more effective it will be.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) PLAN WORKING DRAFT (TERRI STEWART): The S&T Plan Working Draft was completed Friday and transmitted to the Expert Panel. It will be a topic at the upcoming Expert Panel meetings. The current plan is to take the information in the S&T Plan and house it within the Project Specification (Spec). Both should become part of the of the Project Baseline in the December timeframe. We're working on the roadmap and getting more specific information on how it ties to the LRP. (Copies of the S&T Plan are available by contacting Terri Stewart at 509-375-4423 or by e-mailing your request to terri.stewart@pnl.gov)

EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS (BOB PETERSON): The next Expert Panel meetings will be Friday, November 19 through Saturday, November 21. The current agenda is a product of interaction between the GW/VZ Project and the Expert Panel members. The items you see reflect input from as recently as Friday. The Panel would like to focus on the broader issues instead of specific technical issues. The technical issues will likely be addressed by sub-panels. If you look at the handout that I passed out earlier (reproduced below), you'll see three bullets listing items that the Panel would like to work on during these meetings.

- Long Range Plan: Strategy and Project Baseline
 - Project Specification document
 - Working session to frame review and comment

- Applied Science and Technology Plan
 - Highlights of working draft
 - Working session to frame review and comment
- Discuss Role of GW/VZ Integration Project Expert Panel
 - Previous vadose zone panel recommendations
 - Interaction with other expert panels (e.g., groundwater)
 - Operation of the panel and logistics

The first item is the LRP/Baseline. They have the Draft Strategy document, the Project Spec, and the S&T Plan to be able to review them in advance. The Project Spec they have is an updated and revised version, and it includes S&T. After the presentation on the LRP, they will go into a closed working session to be able to look at the materials as a Panel and be able to frame comments.

The second item is the S&T Plan that Terri Stewart mentioned was sent to the panel Friday. This will follow a similar format. After hearing the presentation, they will take time while they are here to work on reviews and comments.

QUESTION: Is this the same Project Spec document that was released in August?

ANSWER: It has been expanded since then.

COMMENT: My understanding of the Project Baseline that is coming out in December is that it will be a combination of the Project Spec and the Strategy document that came out in September. The Project Spec that was released in August was a joke. It was called "an embarrassment" by Under Secretary Moniz. The September Strategy document was more or less a history document. So the plan is to take something that's flawed and put some history on top of it? That's nuts.

RESPONSE: Take a look at the new version of the Spec. The Project Spec that was released in August was part of our learning process. It demonstrated how this Project is so different from anything else. A typical Project Spec is a document that is about forty or so pages long that is a general scoping statement. It's just an agreement with DOE-Richland (RL) as to the Project scope.

COMMENT: But the Spec in August didn't have that. The September document certainly didn't cover that either. I was under the impression that the August document was to be scrapped and rewritten. Has something changed from that date?

RESPONSE: It is being redone, but the old stuff is not being completely scrapped. It's being refocussed.

COMMENT: It was agreed to use the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) as a template. From the time that commitment was made, there was zero attempt to integrate anything. I (Greg deBruler) dropped out of involvement with the Project until August when the Project Spec came out. It was supposed to provide focus, but it didn't meet that expectation. My concern is that you have a document that was severely flawed in August, and then you're laying another document over the top of it. You say read it, but you also say it's not fundamentally changed. If that's the case, I've already read it.

RESPONSE: If you're looking for the Project focus and where the Project is going, that's the LRP. If you're looking for how to address the CRCIA requirements, then that's a separate document. What is it that you are looking for?

COMMENT: I'm not going to put my expectations out on the table. If I was doing this, I'd do it a completely different way. I don't want you turning this around and blaming me if you fail to produce a quality document. You put out a document that you called a Project Specification, and it doesn't have specifications. This document just didn't cut it. You're going down the road, you haven't fixed the things that were wrong previously, and now you're adding more.

RESPONSE: If you tell me what it is you're looking for, we can tell you if it's something that exists or if it's something that is coming and where it's captured.

RESPONSE: December 18 is hopefully the document that will allow you to see everything laid out so you can see if we are on track with the CRCIA by your estimation.

RESPONSE: I think there were pieces in the Draft State of Knowledge and Strategy that were a much better compass of where we're going, but you have to understand that the Strategy was a quickie document that was put together in an extremely short time in response to a request from DOE-HQ. We're going to add the S&T Plan to that. There will be an updated SAC that incorporates CRCIA. We're not just going to add chunks onto the Project Spec. It's a complete scrub. The S&T Plan is open for all to look at. Plus there are other pieces getting put together for the Expert Panel. We'll make those available when they're done.

COMMENT: I thought the issue of the Spec and the Baseline was covered a couple of weeks ago.

COMMENT: I'm becoming confused with all the different names of the documents and what each of them is.

COMMENT: Join the club.

RESPONSE: That's one of the things we're trying to fix with the Project Baseline in December. We're going to try to have all of those in one place, in one document.

QUESTION: One other thing is confusing me. There was a lot of work done with the National Labs. I believe that part of that was a Gaps Analysis. Is that getting captured anywhere?

ANSWER: The S&T Plan is related to that. Look under the Issues section. That's the Gaps Analysis.

QUESTION: Does a flowchart exist now that shows what things came from where and when?

ANSWER: Yes, we did that. We realized that we were kind of overwhelming people. We've developed a new document hierarchy with the LRP/Baseline at the top. We'll attach something to the meeting minutes to try to help clear things up.

QUESTION: I thought the concept was that risk and impact would drive the Expert Panel, but there are no risk or impact people on the panel. Are you asking the right group of people the right questions, or are you just asking for a buy-in on the model?

RESPONSE: Are you referring to this upcoming meeting? I'm lost.

RESPONSE: The idea is to ask them for agreement with overall Project scope and direction. We're trying to get buy-in to the LRP and projected outcomes.

RESPONSE: The LRP has to reflect the effects pieces.

COMMENT: But there are no risk or impact people on the Panel. It seems like a conflict of interest.

QUESTION: When are you going to put a toxicologist or a risk expert on the Panel?

COMMENT: I'd like to request another member be appointed to the Panel with expertise in this area.

RESPONSE: The Panel was designed to recognize when they lacked certain knowledge or expertise and convene ad hoc panels to address those things.

COMMENT: When is that going to happen? What is being said is legitimate, and an ad hoc panel should be put together for this.

RESPONSE: The Panel members themselves understand that there are times when they need added help, but they want to be the focus to bring in the help. The intent is to have the eight Panel members bring in the other experts.

COMMENT: If the ultimate goal of the assessment is to determine risk, and the Expert Panel has no experience in risk and impact, then essentially you have a lower group calling in a higher level group. It should be the other way around.

RESPONSE: We need to bring this up with the Panel.

COMMENT: It's like a sub-level group calling in a higher layer that sets the whole Project.

COMMENT: The Expert Panel is a bunch of hydrologists. It should have been comprised of more generalists.

RESPONSE: Only two of the eight are hydrologists. The Panel was selected partly by their areas of expertise, but many of them have a wide range of general experience and knowledge. Berkey and Kavanaugh are two that jump to mind right away. The Expert Panel will call in other experts for help on details beyond their expertise. This upcoming meeting is looking at the LRP, not risk. We're still working at a pretty high level. We're not ready to zero in yet.

COMMENT: The point is that if the commitment is CRCIA as the high-level umbrella for this Project, then we need to be meshing the philosophy of the whole Project with that.

QUESTION: Do you feel that perhaps the issues of technical philosophy need to be set forth?

COMMENT: Absolutely. It's getting lost in a lot of details. We're going through fifty pages of CRCIA crosswalk, and it may or may not get us where we want to go because we're not doing that constant cross check.

RESPONSE: It's an agenda point to talk over those principles. There's a lot out there to discuss.

COMMENT: I think it would make a lot of sense to lay down the philosophical underpinnings early on.

RESPONSE: If you look at the third bullet on the sheet, it refers to discussing the role of the Expert Panel.

COMMENT: (Mike Hughes) I'm thinking that part of the problem is that everybody needs to visualize the big picture a little better. That goes back to the discussion about the LRP and the visual of the LRP that everyone will see tomorrow. It's a flowchart. In the LRP, you have the assessment phase and the cleanup phase. Over the top of each of those is near-term and long-term. Inside both are interim and final states. I think what Tom Wintczak is doing is taking the input, looking at the core projects - be they TWRS, ER, Waste, or whatever, and plotting the big ticket items, be they cleanup or assessment. Under all of that are the S&T, SAC, site characterizations, and all those other tools for decision making. The problem is that there are big disconnects in certain spots. We need to line them back up so that actions are being done when and where they should be. For example, it might show that by 2000 or 2001 that the assessments all need to be more lined up. Does the Expert Panel see this big picture yet? Do any of you? Right now, everybody's on their own regulatory framework, be it RCRA, CERCLA, or whatever. When everything is lined up and you get that all together, you can identify the people needed to make the decisions to drive the LRP and cleanup. This needs to be lined up first. Whether it takes six months or a year, you need the people lined up to answer the right questions, whatever process you're following. I'm starting to see it now with the big map on the wall that Tom is putting together. It's like a giant puzzle, and it's starting to take shape. You can see where there are pieces missing, but overall you can begin to identify what the picture is going to look like. If this all doesn't come together early on, we're going to continue on down the path and not answer questions. Whether we like it or not, we're in a state of operations on the site, and things are going to keep moving forward. One of the reasons for creating the Integration Project was that we all have a different expectations of where things need to go. Some people say to understand where you're going you have the know where you've been. Some say that they've got to have this data or that data for near-term or long-term decisions. As a total Project, you have to ask the right questions. What do these things support? Is it needed for now or later? Is it needed for assessment? What are people basing near and long-term decisions on? You need to bring it all together so you don't pass up on things that are needed to make the correct decisions.

COMMENT: The ideal logic diagram would be develop the model, use the model, and then make your decisions. However, that's not going to happen in sequence. It's all iterative. You might have a lousy model now, but you hope to have a better one in the future, and you can't just shut down the whole project until it's better. It all needs to be worked in parallel.

COMMENT: It needs to be a holistic model. The idea should be to bring everybody together so they are all following the same path, not an assortment of individual paths that may either be conflicting or duplicating efforts.

COMMENT: The earlier you develop a good assessment tool, the better equipped you'll be to get buy-in from the regulators.

RESPONSE: It sounds to me like a reaffirmation to the Expert Panel is what's needed. Is that correct?

COMMENT: We need an agreement on the principles of how to do an assessment and how we want the site to look in 100 years. That kind of thing. We need to have something down on paper that we can look at and say "these are the principles we want to try to stick to." They lead you on how to think. Right now this Project just looks like a glorified tool kit.

COMMENT: When you look at this model, however it looks, we need to assess how large the uncertainties are. We need to identify how much we really don't know. The Retrieval Performance Evaluation (RPE) shows very large uncertainties in how the model looks. How do you make decisions with that?

RESPONSE: You lay the information on the table for the decision makers.

COMMENT: This becomes an iterative process. It's not just the model but also the decision making. Don't spend a whole lot of time and/or money on specifics that you're uncertain about. Put the focus where it needs to be. When you do these things, you think you're getting answers, but you're really getting just guidance.

RESPONSE: This issue of uncertainty and how to make decisions in light of gaps is something we recognize is a tough nut to crack. We're talking about meetings in January.

COMMENT: Let's get back to the Expert Panel meetings that are coming. The meetings are scheduled from 7:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, 9:30 a.m. to noon on Friday, and 7:30 a.m. to noon on Saturday. There is scheduled time on Saturday for stakeholder comments to the Panel. There were comments at the last meeting that scheduling the meetings during the week didn't allow for all of the interested parties to participate. The Panel took that under advisement and decided to meet on Saturday as well, in order to give those people that couldn't attend during the week a chance to participate.

COMMENT: Saturday's fine, but it's at the tail-end of the meeting. It would be more effective to have the stakeholders up front to be able to have some effect on the direction of the meetings.

COMMENT: We talked in the TWRS meetings about a possible sub-panel to help the Expert Panel on TWRS issues, perhaps defining the benefits of certain types of characterizations, etc. We asked TWRS to figure out how something like that would be funded.

RESPONSE: We've wrestled with how to convene sub-panels and how they should work. It's an issue that needs to be discussed with the main Panel.

COMMENT: Maybe we could get the same guys from this Panel that were on the SX Panel. Four of the five members of that old panel are on the Expert Panel. It's possible that they might find it useful for this process.

COMMENT: One of the issues that has come up during the negotiations is that we'd like to have some measure of detail so that stakeholders, regulators, and Tribes could buy-in. It would improve the product to have a panel of experts operating on an ongoing basis. It would be nice to have some sort of group that can be used in making decisions, or somebody to mediate things between DOE and the regulators.

RESPONSE: The Expert Panel was never meant to be a mediator. The intent is for them to be an independent third party to review decisions. You need to be the decision makers.

OTHER ISSUES:

COMMENT: (Mike Hughes) I have one more thing. These Weekly Project Meetings are not quite what I think they should be. People seem to have a very hard time keeping focused. This should be a Project Status Meeting. Somebody should be taking actions items. For even such a large group, an hour and a half should not be too long to maintain focus. If the focus was maintained, I don't think these meetings would last even half as long as they do. Maybe what's needed is a facilitator and a white board to capture stuff. Some of the items that are being discussed with such passion and in such detail are exactly the sort of things that belong in one of the three Work Groups. That's why we convened them in the first place, as a forum to discuss issues.

RESPONSE: People know that I (Michael Graham) drive meetings in general, but I let this meeting go a little because I think people need a forum to discuss their concerns about the Project.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

UPCOMING EVENTS:

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

NOTE:

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

ATTACHMENT:

- 1) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar
- 2) GW/VZ Document Information

ATTENDEES:

Bob Alvarez - DOE-HQ
Martin Bensky - General Public
John Brodeur - Mactec-ERS
Bob Bryce - PNNL
Dru Butler - BHI
Don Clark - JAI Corp.
Jerry Davis - Numatec
Greg deBruler - Columbia River United
Dirk Dunning - Oregon Office of Energy
Bryan Foley - DOE-RL
Owen Goodman - BHI
Dib Goswami - Ecology
Michael Graham - BHI
Loren Habegger - CRE
Mary Harmon - DOE-HQ
Barbara Harper - YIN
George Henckle - BHI
Doug Hildebrand - DOE-RL
Rich Holten - DOE-RL

Michael Hughes - BHI
Dick Jacwicz - WDOH
Gary Jewell - BHI
Sue Kuntz - BHI
Stan Leja - Ecology
Fred Mann - FDNW
Dave Olson - DOE-RL
Bob Peterson - BHI
Jim Poppiti - DOE-RL
Tom Post - EPA
Wade Riggsbee - YIN
Gordon Rogers - General Public
Ron Skinnarland - Ecology
Ron Smith - PNNL
Stan Sobczyk - NPT
Terri Stewart - PNNL
Tom Wintczak - BHI
Al Young - CRE

Attachment 1

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR
NOVEMBER 9, 1998 - DECEMBER 21, 1998
GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT

<i>November 9</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>November 9-12</i>	Mary Harmon and Bob Alvarez from DOE-HQ on site
<i>November 10</i>	Long Range Plan/Project Baseline Work Group Meeting (with HQ) 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. - BHI Room 1B40
<i>November 10 & 12</i>	System Assessment Capability Work Group Meetings 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. - BHI - Assembly Room (10th) and Room 1B40 (12th)
<i>November 12</i>	Tri-Party Agreement Public Forum - Spent Nuclear Fuels 7:00 p.m. - Portland, OR - State Office Building
<i>November 13</i>	Groundwater Model Consolidation - Technical detail discussion "Geology Framework" 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. - PNNL - EESB - Snoqualmie Room
<i>November 16</i>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. - BHI - Room 1B40
<i>November 16</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>November 18</i>	S&T Roadmap Working Meeting 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - PNNL ETB Columbia River Room
<i>November 19-21</i>	GW/VZ Expert Panel Meetings BHI Assembly Room
<i>November 20-21</i>	Hanford Groundwater Project (HGWP) External Peer Review of Site-Wide Groundwater Model Richland, WA
<i>November 23</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>November 30</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>November 30- December 2</i>	Year-End Project Review with DOE-HQ
<i>December 7</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>December 14</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<i>December 21</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room

Attachment 2

GW/VZ Document Information

Cost and Schedule Baseline

- Project Description/Project Assumptions
 - Near term detail
- Project Summary
 - Scope, Logic, Cost, LRP
- Cost Basis and Assumptions
- Contingency Analysis
- Cost
 - Near term detail
 - Lifecycle Summary and Detail
- Schedule
 - Near term detail
 - Lifecycle time phasing of costs

Project Specification Outline

- Introduction
 - Project drivers, stakeholder concerns, and core values
 - Mission statement - three parts (SAC, Integration, S&T)
 - Vision statement - broad trust, collaboration, credible decisions
 - Challenges and Opportunities - five areas of challenges which are the five “business” areas of the Project (Integration, SAC, S&T, PI, Peer Review)
 - Project overview - simplified logic diagram, system engineering approach, summary of Project - controlling documents
- Requirements/Values/Recommendations
 - Requirements - summary of the laws, regulations, and agreements
 - Values - results of interviews and correspondence
 - Recommendations - external oversight recommendations of core projects
- Project Strategy and Approach
 - Introduction - science-based approach, SAC is the “backbone”
 - Planning periods - define the time periods of interest (e.g. immediate, cleanup mission, post-mission stewardship)
 - Strategic objectives/performance indicators/strategies - grouped by five “businesses”
 - Current approach - project logic, descriptions of activities within the five “businesses”
- Technical Element Scope Descriptions
 - Technical information elements
 - Methods and capabilities elements
 - Controls and constraints elements
- Appendices
 - Crosswalk to GPMP requirements
 - Summary table of laws/regulations
 - Summary table of external review comments and recommendations
 - Current state of knowledge
 - System Assessment Capability description (evolution from CRCIA)
 - S&T Plan backup/supporting materials